## United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Nan	ne of Assigned Judy or Magistrate Judy		Gottschall	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge			
CA	SE NUMBE	R 01 C	3871	DATE	12/5/	2003	
CASE TITLE			James Morgan vs. Bill Kay Chrysler Plymouth				
MOTION: [In the following box (a) indicate the party filing the motion, e.g., plaintiff, defendant, 3rd party plaintiff, and (b) state briefly the nature of the motion being presented.]							
Plaintiff's motion to reconsider the award of attorney's fees							
DOCKET ENTRY:							
(1)	l)  □ Filed motion of [ use listing in "Motion" box above.]						
(2)	□ Bri	Brief in support of motion due					
(3)	□ An	Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due					
(4)	□ Rụi	Ruling/Hearing on set for at					
(5)	□ Sta	Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at					
(6)	Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at						
(7)	Trial[set for/re-set for] on at						
(8)	□ [Be	[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at					
(9)		This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to]  FRCP4(m)   FRCP41(a)(1)  FRCP41(a)(2).					
(10) [Other docket entry] For the reasons stated on the reverse side of this minute order, plaintiff's motion to reconsider the award of attorney's fees [25-1] is denied.							
Janthe							
(11) For further detail see order on the reverse side of the original minute order.]							
	•	ed, advised in open court.				Document Number	
	No notices require Notices mailed by				number of notices		
<u> </u>	Notified counsel b	* *			DEC X &	~/	
	Docketing to mail notices.  Mail AO 450 form.		CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT		15 28		
					docketing deputy Initials	Tinitials .	
Copy to judge/magistrate judge.			•				
Courtroom deputy's			13 DEC -5 AM 9: 07		date mailed notice		
[	1/16	initials	EQ.JO	e received in	mailing de-un initial		
I	t	l	j çentral C	lerk's Office	mailing deputy initials		

Reverse Side of 12/5/03 Minute Order 01 C 3871 James Morgan v. Bill Kay Chrysler Plymouth

In its order of September 19, 2003, the court awarded plaintiff James Morgan \$1,705 in attorneys fees after plaintiff prevailed at arbitration on his claim that defendant sold him a car with a fraudulent odometer reading. Plaintiff now asks the court to reconsider its award to the extent that any part of it was based on the written notice requirement of the Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act ("Consumer Fraud Act"), 815 ILCS § 505/10a(h), as plaintiff asserts that at least one Illinois court has held that portion of the Consumer Fraud Act unconstitutional. See Allen V. Woodfield Chevrolet, Inc., No. 1-01-3131, 2002 WL 1402017 (III. App. Ct. June 28, 2002). A review of this court's original order, however, reveals that the court did not rely on the Consumer Fraud Act's written notice requirement in calculating plaintiff's fee award. In fact, the court in footnote 4 specifically stated that it would, in exercising its discretion to award fees under the Act, reach the same result whether the communications between plaintiff and defendant were in writing or not. Plaintiff has advanced no other reasons for the court to reconsider its award, and the court finds none of its own; plaintiff's motion to reconsider is therefore denied.